Remarks

Claims 1–5, 7–8, 13–14, and 21–29 are pending in this application. Claims 9–12 and 30 have been canceled. Claims 1, 13, and 21–25 have been amended in response to the office action and to make editorial changes. The amended claims are fully supported by the specification. No new matter has been added.

Section 101 Rejection

Claim 13 has been amended to recite "using a computer processor" to overcome the section 101 rejection. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Section 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1–5, 7–8, and 21–22 were rejected under section 103(a) as being anticipated by "A Current Driven Routing and Verification Methodology for Analog Applications" (Adler) in view of U.S. patent 7,168,041 (Durrill). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by Adler. Claims 24–29 were rejected under section 103(a)as being unpatentable over Adler in view of U.S. patent 6,543,041 (Scheffer) and further in view of Durrill.

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Applicants continue to disagree with the examiner for the reasons previously stated in the record. See, e.g., appeal brief filed February 29, 2008. The prior art is absent any features as recited in the claims.

Further, for example, claim 1 recites "and a fourth subnet route for *a fourth subnet* which is coupled at a first end to the first and second subnets and coupled at a second end to the third subnet" and "the fourth subnet has *a wider interconnect width than the first, second, or third subnet*."

Adler does not show or suggest this specific feature, where a fourth subnet coupled to subnets where it is widened with respect to those subnets. Adler's figures 6–8 on pages 387–388 do not show this. Rather Adler describes in those figures and sections 5 and 6 (pages 388–389) a current density simulator (CDS) that is for verifying multiterminal nets with respect to current densities. The CDS tool does not make any alterations to widths of interconnect. Rather CDS is a

tool to check the results of a router such as the described current driven router (CDR). Figure 9 shows errors as identified by the CDS tool.

For at least this reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2–5, 7–8, and 21–22 should be allowable. Furthermore, claim 21 recites "based on a *digital circuit performance requirement* difference between the signals on the first and second nets." As described on page 385 of Adler, the CDR and CDS tools are for analog applications, not digital. The technique embodied in claim 21 is not contemplated by Adler. Adler is directed at digital circuit performance.

Claims 13–14 should be allowable for at least similar reasons as discussed for claim 1.

Claim 23 recites "the automatic shape-based router tool creates *a second net* of the integrated circuit design, wherein the second net has *a spacing so that the second net is spaced at least a first distance from the first net*" and "the automatic shape-based router tool creates *a third net* of the integrated circuit design, wherein the third net has *a spacing so that the third net is spaced at least a second distance from the first net, wherein the second distance is less than the first distance*."

Adler does not show or suggest that CDR or CDS can alter spacing between different net. For at least this reason, claim 23 should be allowable.

Claim 24–29 should be allowable for at least similar reasons as discussed for claim 23.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be

issued in this case. If the examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please contact the signee.

<div align="center">

Respectfully submitted,

Aka Chan LLP

/Melvin D. Chan/

Melvin D. Chan
Reg. No. 39,626

</div>

Aka Chan LLP
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: (408) 701-0035
Fax: (408) 608-1599
E-mail: mel@akachanlaw.com